

Appl. No. 09/881,788
Docket No. 2102397-910800
Response to Office Action of December 10, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-29 remain in the application. Claims 1-29 have been rejected. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Jolitz* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0004354).

As understood *Jolitz* at best merely describes a network accelerator for TCP/IP that includes "programmable logic for performing transparent protocol translation of streamed protocols for audio/video at network signaling rates." (see abstract.) The network accelerator includes "an isochronous 'stimulus/response' architecture using a variable content addressable memory that has preprogrammed state logic that effects protocol processing as a minimum time series of operations." (paragraph 0017). The network accelerator processes TCP/IP data packets using gate array hardware to recognize a large portion of the packets and to process these recognized packets via hardware. Other packets are processed using software. (paragraph 0013). The network protocol accelerator 10 includes a data path through an Rx/Tx FIFO bypass 16 that bypasses an accelerator engine 14 for non-TCP data transfers or for failures of the accelerator engine 14. (paragraph 0032). A physical media framing 12 provides data packets to the accelerator engine 14. The accelerator engine 14 consults a variable content addressable memory 22 "to find a match with predetermined patterns" in the memory 22. "When a match is found, a state machine associated with the pattern is loaded from the content addressable memory into the accelerator engine to operate on the packet." (paragraph 0032).

A content addressable memory 54 within the content addressable memory 22 determines to which session an incoming IP datagram or packet belongs. (paragraph 0047). The content addressable memory 22 stores addresses of potential TCP sessions. Incoming TCP segments are used by the content addressable memory 22 to determine whether portions of an incoming segment match certain fields stored in the content addressable memory 22. If there is no match, the incoming TCP segment is sent through the bypass FIFO 16. Otherwise "the memory stores at the 'hashed' address another address which points to the prototype data in the prototype memory." (paragraph 0050). "The IP source and destination addresses, plus the TCP source and

Page 8 of 12

EM\7184986.1
351913-910800

Appl. No. 09/881,788
Docket No. 2102397-910800
Response to Office Action of December 10, 2004

destination ports, may be hashed together to form a value which is used as an address to look up in the content addressable memory the address for the Rx prototype." (paragraph 0078). "The value returned by the content addressable memory is used as the base address for the Rx prototype for the segment. The prototype is read in the IP address and the TCP ports are compared against prototype values. If they match, the segment is accepted for further processing, and the ADE base address is read from the prototype memory array." (paragraph 0079).

The system of *Jolitz* provides an internet interface that recognizes the most frequently used packets and implements protocols for executing sessions in response to these packets using hardware rather than software. As understood *Jolitz* does not define what constitutes the frequently used packets and thus does not define with any particularity the packets and sessions that are to be stored in the content addressable memory 22. In contrast, Claim 1 recites "a content addressable memory storing at least one pre-determined server identifier and user information associated with the at least one pre-determined server identifier." The addresses provided by the content addressable memory of *Jolitz* is not user information associated with a pre-determined server identifier as recited in claim 1. Thus, *Jolitz* does not disclose or even suggest the "user information associated with the at least one pre-determined server identifier" recited in Claim 1. Further Claim 1 recites a controller for "determining whether there is a match between the received server identifier and one of the at least one pre-determined server identifier and for providing the user information associated with the matching pre-determined server identifier." *Jolitz* describes detecting a match between a packet and returning a base address for an Rx prototype for the segment. See paragraph 0079. Returning a base address as disclosed in *Jolitz* is not providing the user information associated with matching pre-determined server identifier recited in Claim 1.

Applicant notes that all features in a claim must be disclosed in art under a Section 102(e) rejection. Lacking the disclosure or even suggestion of at least this claim feature, *Jolitz* cannot render Claim 1 unpatentable. Because Claims 2-9 depend on Claim 1, *Jolitz* cannot render Claims 2-9 unpatentable. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-9 are patentable over the references of record.

Appl. No. 09/861,788
Docket No. 2102397-910800
Response to Office Action of December 10, 2004

Claim 10 recites "comparing in a memory card wallet a received server identifier received by the memory card wallet to at least one pre-selected server identifiers stored in the memory card wallet" and "providing user information stored in the memory card wallet and associated with the stored pre-selected server identifier in the event that the memory card determines that the received server identifier matches one of the at least one pre-selected server identifiers stored in the memory card wallet." As an illustrative embodiment, the memory card wallet may store a website address and user name and password for the identified website. The memory card wallet provides the user name and password in response to a match between the received website address received by the memory card wallet and the website address stored in the memory card wallet.

Claim 10 recites the comparing in the memory card wallet. As understood *Jolitz* does not disclose or even suggest a memory card wallet. *Jolitz* describes a memory accelerator that may be used in a cellular telephone as shown in Figure 7. This is not the memory card wallet recited in claim 10. Also as described above *Jolitz* does not disclose or even suggest user information associated with a stored pre-selected server identifier as recited in claim 10.

Lacking the disclosure or suggestion of at least these claimed features, *Jolitz* cannot render Claim 10 unpatentable. Because Claims 11-21 depend on Claim 10, *Jolitz* cannot render Claims 11-21 unpatentable. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that Claims 10-21 are patentable over the references of record.

Claim 22 recites "providing information stored in the memory card wallet and corresponding to the identifier from the memory card wallet to the host in the event that the memory card wallet determines that there is a match between the received identifier and a pre-determined identifier stored in the memory card wallet." As noted above, *Jolitz* does not disclose or even suggest a memory card wallet. Lacking the disclosure or even suggestion of at least this claim feature, *Jolitz* cannot render Claim 22 unpatentable. Because claims 23-27 depend on Claim 22, *Jolitz* cannot render Claims 23-27 unpatentable. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 22-27 are patentable over the references of record.

Appl. No. 09/881,788
Docket No. 2102397-910800
Response to Office Action of December 10, 2004

Claim 28 recites "a memory card wallet storing a server identifier and authorization request information associated with at least one server, determining whether there is a match between said user request and said server identifier stored in said memory card wallet, and providing said authorization request information in the event that the memory card wallet determines said match." As understood *Jolitz* at best merely discloses storing packet information and an address in a content addressable memory. The content addressable memory outputs the address in the event that the IP packet matches the packet stored in the content addressable memory. In contrast, Claim 28 recites a server providing a prompt in response to a user request and allowing access to a portion of a resource in response to a request. Further, Claim 28 recites a memory card wallet, which as described above, is not disclosed or even suggested in *Jolitz*. Therefore, *Jolitz* does not disclose or even suggest a memory card wallet determining whether there is a match between a user request and a server identifier stored in a memory card wallet providing the authorization request information in the event that the memory card wallet determines a match. Lacking the disclosure or even suggestion of at least this claim feature, *Jolitz* cannot render Claim 28 unpatentable. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 28 is patentable over the references of record.

Claim 29 recites "providing from the memory card wallet the second user-selected identifier in the event that the memory card wallet determines that there is a match between the first user-selected identifier and a stored entry in the memory card wallet." As described above, *Jolitz* does not disclose or even suggest a memory card wallet. Further, *Jolitz* does not disclose or even suggest a memory card wallet that provides a second user-selected identifier in the event that the memory card wallet determines there is a match between a first user-selected identifier in a stored entry in the memory card wallet as recited in Claim 29. The network accelerator of *Jolitz* receives an IP packet and provides an address in response to a match with the IP packet. Claim 29 recites providing from the memory card wallet a second user-selected identifier in the event that there is a match between a first user-selected identifier and a stored entry. Lacking the disclosure or even suggestion of at least this claim feature, *Jolitz* cannot render Claim 29 unpatentable. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 29 is patentable over the references of record.


Appl. No. 09/881,788
Docket No. 2102397-910800
Response to Office Action of December 10, 2004

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in an allowable form, and action to that end is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees necessary for extensions of time, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 07-1896, referencing 2102397-910800.

Respectfully submitted,
DLA Piper Rudnick Gray Cary US LLP

Dated: April 7, 2005



Edward B. Weller
Reg. No. 37,468
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Edward B. Weller
DLA Piper Rudnick Gray Cary US LLP
2000 University Avenue
East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2248
650-833-2436 (Direct)
650-833-2000 (Main)
650-833-2001 (Facsimile)
eweller@graycary.com